

NOV 02 2009

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

EFRAIN GONZALEZ; MARIA
GUADALUPE GASPAR; KARIM
GONZALEZ; PABLO ANTONIO
GONZALEZ,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

Nos. 06-75242
07-70814

Agency Nos. A075-740-768
A075-740-769
A075-740-770
A075-740-771

MEMORANDUM^{*}

On Petitions for Review of Orders of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted October 13, 2009^{**}

Before: B. FLETCHER, LEAVY, and RYMER, Circuit Judges.

In these consolidated petitions for review, Efrain Gonzalez and his family,
natives and citizens of Mexico, seek review of the Board of Immigration Appeals'

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent
except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without
oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

(“BIA”) orders denying their motion to reopen and their motion to reconsider. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen, *Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 894 (9th Cir. 2003), and we deny the petitions for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion by denying petitioners’ motion to reopen, because the BIA considered the evidence they submitted and acted within its broad discretion in determining that the evidence was insufficient to warrant reopening. *See Singh v. INS*, 295 F.3d 1037, 1039 (9th Cir. 2002) (The BIA’s denial of a motion to reopen shall be reversed only if it is “arbitrary, irrational or contrary to law.”).

In their opening brief, petitioners fail to address and therefore have waived any challenge to the BIA’s denial of their motion to reconsider. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259-60 (9th Cir. 1996) (issues not specifically raised and argued in a party’s opening brief are waived).

PETITIONS FOR REVIEW DENIED.